

MINUTES OF THE
MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
June 11, 2008
MAG Office Building - Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Charlie McClendon, Avondale, Chair | Christopher Brady, Mesa |
| Mark Pentz, Chandler, Vice Chair | Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley |
| George Hoffman, Apache Junction | Terry Ellis, Peoria |
| * Jeanine Guy, Buckeye | Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix |
| Jon Pearson, Carefree | John Kross, Queen Creek |
| Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek | * Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa |
| Spencer Isom for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage | Indian Community |
| Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester, | John Little, Scottsdale |
| Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation | Doug Sandstrom for Prisila Ferreira, Surprise |
| # Kate Zanon, Fountain Hills | Charlie Meyer, Tempe |
| * Gila Bend | # Chris Hagen for Reyes Medrano, Tolleson |
| Joseph Manuel, Gila River Indian | Gary Edwards, Wickenburg |
| Community | Mark Hannah for Lloyce Robinson, |
| George Pettit, Gilbert | Youngtown |
| * Ed Beasley, Glendale | * Victor Mendez, ADOT |
| John Fischbach, Goodyear | Kenny Harris for David Smith, |
| * RoseMary Arellano, Guadalupe | Maricopa County |
| * Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park | David Boggs, Valley Metro/RPTA |
- * Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.
Participated by telephone conference call.
+ Participated by videoconference call.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Charlie McClendon at 12:02 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Kate Zanon and Chris Hagen joined the meeting by teleconference.

Chair McClendon noted materials at each place: for agenda item #5E, color copies of the maps showing water stations and donation centers; for agenda item #8, the Executive Summary and a copy of the presentation; and for agenda item #10, a bill summary chart. Chair McClendon announced that parking garage validation and transit tickets were available from Valley Metro/RPTA for those using transit to come to the meeting.

Chair McClendon noted that this was the last meeting for Terry Ellis. He read the Resolution of Appreciation that was prepared in recognition of Mr. Ellis' service to the MAG region. Mr. Ellis thanked the Committee for the Resolution and commented that MAG is a model for the country. He informed members that in his retirement he wanted to do some work in non-profit or social services fields.

Mr. Fairbanks complimented Mr. Ellis on his outstanding accomplishments in the region. He commented that due to Mr. Ellis' work, Peoria is a professionally operating organization. Mr. Fairbanks stated that Mr. Ellis' peers enjoy their relationship with him beyond day to day work.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair McClendon stated that Call to the Audience provides an opportunity to the public to address the Management Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Chair McClendon noted that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard. Public comments have a three minute time limit and there is a timer to help the public with their presentations. Chair McClendon noted that no public comment cards had been received.

4. Executive Director's Report

Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, reported the 2008 Desert Peaks Awards will be held on June 25, 2008, at the Arizona Biltmore Resort. He said that the Regional Council meeting will begin at 5:00 p.m., a reception at 5:30 p.m., and the Awards at 6:15 p.m. Mr. Smith stated that more than 220 people have registered so far to attend the no-cost event. He noted the final segment of the Proposition 300 is almost complete, and in recognition of this accomplishment, MAG's past officers will be recognized at the Awards for their courage in asking for a half cent sales tax in Proposition 300.

Mr. Smith stated that on the evening of June 10th a bomb threat had been called in to the building that houses the MAG offices. He expressed his appreciation to the Phoenix Police Department for conducting a sweep of the building, and added that they did not find any explosive device.

Chair McClendon thanked Mr. Smith for his report. No questions for Mr. Smith were noted.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair McClendon stated that agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, and #5E were on the consent agenda. Chair McClendon reviewed the public comment guidelines for the consent agenda. He noted that no public comment cards had been received.

Chair McClendon asked if any member of the committee had questions or a request to have a presentation on any consent agenda item. None were noted.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, and #5E. Mr. Fairbanks seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5A. Approval of May 14, 2008 Meeting Minutes

The Management Committee, by consent, approved the May 14, 2008 meeting minutes.

5B. Consultant Selection for the MAG Intelligent Transportation Systems and Transportation Safety On-Call Services

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the selected list of consultants for the ITS and Transportation Safety on-call services, for the following areas of expertise: (1) Traffic Engineering, (2) ITS Planning, (3) ITS Operations Planning, (4) ITS Training, (5) ITS Evaluation, and (6) Transportation Safety. The FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget includes a number of projects to be launched in the areas of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Transportation Safety. These projects will be executed through on-call consultant contracts with qualified consultants selected in each of the six areas of expertise. A request for qualifications was advertised on March 2, 2008. Two selection panels, composed of members of the ITS Committee and the Transportation Safety Committee, evaluated the proposals and reached consensus to recommend to MAG the selection of a number of qualified consultant teams in each of the areas of expertise.

5C. Draft Fiscal Year 2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the Draft FY 2009 Arterial Life Cycle Program contingent on a new Finding of Conformity for the amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan 2007 Update and FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, which will be finalized in July. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies 94 arterial street projects to receive funding from the regional sales tax extension and from MAG federal funds. The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) provides information for each of the 94 projects spanning a 20-year life cycle. Information contained in the ALCP includes project location, regional funding, fiscal year (FY) of work, type of work, status of project and the lead agency. As part of the ALCP process, Lead Agencies update project information annually, at a minimum. MAG staff has programmed the Draft FY 2009 ALCP based on the information provided by Lead Agencies and from projected revenue streams of the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF), MAG Surface Transportation Program funds (STP-MAG), and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. On May 30, 2008, the Transportation Review Committee recommended approval of the FY 2009 Draft ALCP.

5D. Conformity Consultation

The Maricopa Association of Governments is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for an amendment and administrative modification to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. The proposed amendment includes the addition of new projects and the administrative modification includes minor revisions to existing projects in the TIP as part of the Interim Closeout of the Federal FY 2008 MAG Federally Funded Program. The new projects may be categorized as exempt and the minor project revisions do not require a conformity determination. Comments on the conformity assessment were requested by June 20, 2008. This item was on the agenda for consultation.

5E. Regional Heat Relief Planning Efforts

The Maricopa Association of Governments has developed two maps of resources to help make water and shade available to vulnerable populations during the hot summer months. The first map shows where water hydration stations and refuge locations are located throughout the county, or where people in need can go for water and shade. The second map shows water collection and donation sites in the county, and is useful to people wanting to donate items like water, sun block, lightweight clothing, hats, or other items that provide relief. This item is presented to alert member agencies to resources available throughout the summer months and to solicit assistance in making these resources available. This item was on the agenda for information and discussion.

6. Federal Fiscal Year 2008 MAG Federal Funds Interim Closeout and Amendments /Modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and FY 2008 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget

Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Program Manager, provided a presentation on the federal fiscal year 2008 interim Closeout. Ms. Yazzie provided members with an overview of the Closeout process. She stated that the process and guidelines, first established in 1991, are currently being reviewed and updated.

Ms. Yazzie stated that in the first step, the Initial Closeout, the difference between the MAG STP and CMAQ federal funds and the list of projects programmed in the current federal fiscal year is calculated. She said that the second step in the Closeout process is the Interim Closeout. Project requests are submitted to defer or remove federal funds from a project, and then member agencies identify projects that can utilize the Closeout funds. She stated that the third step is the Final Closeout, where contingency projects are identified that can use additional federal funds, often at very short notice. Ms. Yazzie noted that the Final Closeout is optional and is utilized only if there are contingency projects.

Ms. Yazzie stated that approximately a total of \$130.4 million in CMAQ & STP is available, and approximately a total of \$135 million is programmed. She stated that the projects that are not going to obligate total \$40.1 million, leaving an unobligated balance of approximately \$35.7 million. Ms. Yazzie stated that \$21 million is being carried forward for the Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP), leaving a total in unobligated funds for the federal fiscal year 2008 Closeout of \$14.7 million.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Table A in the agenda material showed the 35 deferred and four deleted projects approved by the Regional Council on May 28, 2008, and total approximately \$40.1 million.

Ms. Yazzie reviewed the current guidelines for Closeout priorities, which are (1) to advance the current federally funded programmed projects that are ready to be obligated; (2) increase the federal share of funds in projects being obligated in the first year of the program, (3) and fund new projects.

Ms. Yazzie reported on projects submitted for the federal fiscal year 2008 Closeout, which are shown in Table B, and include 21 projects, three of which were submitted late. She noted that the projects included seven advancements, one advancement with increased federal funds, nine with an increase of federal funds, and four new projects. Ms. Yazzie advised that the 21 projects submitted totaled approximately \$18 million, the project advancements totaled approximately \$4.7 million, and the increased funds or new projects totaled \$13,711,419. Ms. Yazzie noted that the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) recommended that 18 projects be funded for the federal fiscal year 2008 MAG Closeout. She noted that the projects must be ready to obligate by September 30, 2008, and added that 18 to 24 months of prior work is needed before a project can obligate.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the TRC also recommended approval of a rank ordered list of four projects for the federal fiscal year 2008 Interim Closeout for \$3.75 million in contingency funding. The first project is the remainder of light rail reimbursement, and the second to fourth projects included other advanced and additional fund projects that were submitted late. Ms. Yazzie noted that additional redistributed obligation authority is a possibility. Chair McClendon thanked Ms. Yazzie for her presentation. No questions for Ms. Yazzie were noted.

Mr. Ellis moved to recommend approval of the FFY 2008 Interim Closeout, as shown in the attached tables and recommend amending/adjusting the FY 2008-2012 MAG TIP and the FY 2008 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to allow the projects to proceed. Mr. Fairbanks seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

7. Progress Report on the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, provided an update on the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study. He stated that this is the second framework study conducted in the MAG region. The first framework study was the Interstate 10 - Hassayampa Valley Transportation Framework Study, which was accepted by the Regional Council in February 2008. Mr. Anderson commented that he participated in a recent ULI Reality Check exercise where 300 participants placed Legos® to indicate where they thought the next six million residents might locate in the region. Mr. Anderson noted that almost all of the participants showed growth happening outside developed areas. He commented that it is important to link those areas to what is occurring today. Mr. Anderson stated that a freeway plan takes a long time to implement and noted that the region's freeway program, whose framework was first conceived in 1960 by Wilbur Smith, finally will be completed next month.

Mr. Anderson reported that the Hidden Valley study area covers approximately 3,500 square miles in southwest Maricopa County and western Pinal County. He said that the study determined that entitled development in the study area represents a population of approximately 2.5 million by buildout with approximately one million jobs. Mr. Anderson stated that the purpose of the study is to define high capacity corridors (both highway and transit), establish a future principal arterial network, recommend access management strategies for high capacity corridors, identify the future role of high-capacity transit, and develop alternative funding and implementation strategies. Mr. Anderson noted that all corridor recommendations are illustrative and unfunded at this time.

Mr. Anderson stated that funding partners include MAG, the Arizona Department of Transportation, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the Pinal County Department of Public Works, the Town of Buckeye, the City of Goodyear, and the City of Maricopa. He acknowledged stakeholders and the agencies that participated in the project study review team.

Mr. Anderson noted that the framework study has provided the opportunity to discuss how to develop transportation in an environmentally-friendly way. Mr. Anderson commented that environmental groups understand that growth will happen, and they were very pleased to have early input on identifying corridors that will occur and minimizing the environmental impact. Mr. Anderson commented that the environmental scan incorporated data from the Sonoran Institute.

Mr. Anderson showed maps of the project's Transportation Framework Alternatives. He pointed out the wildlife corridor indicated on the maps. Mr. Anderson stated that Alternative A is balanced capacity; Alternative B is maximum mobility (more capacity on the highway side); and Alternative C is minimum impact (freeways or highways downgraded to smaller footprints).

Mr. Anderson stated that Transit Alternative A is the Base Scenario (identifies high capacity corridors), and Transit Alternative B is the Enhanced Scenario. He displayed a map that combined the maps from the Interstate 10 - Hassayampa Valley Transportation Framework Study and the Interstates 8 and 10-Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study. Mr. Anderson commented that this shows how the transportation corridors will eventually connect. He remarked that some of the corridors are from the TIME Coalition and ADOT Strategic Plan, and the Hassayampa Freeway and the extension of Loop 303 are being proposed as toll roads. Chair McClendon thanked Mr. Anderson for his report. He asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Fairbanks noted that Mr. Anderson had mentioned completion of the freeway plan first envisioned in 1960. He asked if all of the freeways from that plan had been built. Mr. Anderson clarified that he meant almost all of the freeways; unfortunately, one of the key east/west corridors, the Paradise Freeway, was removed in 1995, and he was referring to completion of the Proposition 300 components that remained after the removals that were done in 1995. Mr. Anderson commented that the opportunities for new freeways in developed areas are limited due to neighborhood impacts. He stated that increasing the capacity of the existing highway system is still needed and one of the projects funded as part of Proposition 400 is rebuilding the older part of I-17. Mr. Fairbanks commented that he believed two major components from Proposition 300 were not built. Mr. Anderson added that there were a number of Proposition 300 projects that because they were not built, have hurt the region.

Mr. Harris asked if MAG had any expectation that what is configured for right-of-way will be honored when developers or the private sector comes into an area. Mr. Anderson replied that this would be a part of the implementation phase, but some of the study's findings could be incorporated into a jurisdiction's general plan. He noted that the Town of Buckeye had incorporated the Interstate 10 - Hassayampa Valley Transportation Framework Study findings into their general transportation plan, and the Maricopa County Department of Transportation

was working on parkway concepts. Mr. Anderson added that MAG is working with ADOT to define the centerlines and overall right-of-way requirements. He commented that this is an opportunity to preserve corridors before development happens. Mr. Anderson stated that it will take a lot of work to define the centerlines and work with developers to preserve the corridors. He stated that if this plan is put on a shelf and people do what they want, the great work that has been done to find a rational transportation system in this part of the region will be lost.

Mr. Smith pointed out that the map on the last slide illustrated how interconnected the region is, and there has been a lot of discussion about the Sun Corridor Megapolitan area. Mr. Smith commented that the region does not have a Long Beach port or mainline railroad, but does have Sky Harbor International Airport and Williams Gateway Airport. He noted that 80 percent of Arizona's population is projected to reside in four counties. Mr. Smith stated that at a future meeting, the committee could receive a presentation on what is being studied. He remarked that stopping at the county boundary does not seem to work, and planning beyond the border is needed to gain a true picture of what will happen.

Mr. Fairbanks stated that the map showed a lot of new roads, bus routes, and trains where there are no people. He commented that it seemed that the way to build those is to tax the people who already live in the northwest white area of the map. Mr. Fairbanks said that he wondered if in doing these types of long range plans interest should be shown in the ten or twelve cities located in the white area of the map. He asked if there was a reason to not do this extensive planning process for those areas who already have residents, or is the process focused only on new residents, growth, construction, and development. Mr. Anderson replied that staff could produce a map showing the other work in the rest of the region, which is quite extensive. He stated that the maps shown today were limited to the Hassayampa framework study and the Hidden Valley framework study, which are very long range concepts and the roads will probably not be built for 30 to 40 years. Mr. Anderson commented on the need for setting down an overall framework, otherwise there will be accusations of not looking far enough to the future to get ahead of projected growth. He advised that there are extensive plans for improvements in the white area, many from Proposition 400, such as advance planning for Highway 74, or the New River Road extension of Loop 303 in Phoenix, but they are just not shown on the map.

Mr. Fairbanks asked if Mr. Anderson was saying that this type of planning should be done only for the unoccupied parts of the region, where developers are interested in building and not for the occupied areas. Mr. Anderson replied that they have done work in both occupied and unoccupied areas. Mr. Fairbanks asked if the same type of comprehensive, long term plans exist for the white area. Mr. Anderson replied that the City of Phoenix has a robust street plan for the northwest section and MAG was not going to tell Phoenix how to plan its areas. He commented that there were no plans at all for these areas, and that was the issue; if the developments went forward as planned, the road network would not connect. Mr. Anderson expressed his wish that there could have been plans like this for the metro area. He stated that the cities of Phoenix, Peoria, and Surprise do not need MAG's assistance to design their street systems, although MAG would be glad to assist if asked.

Mr. Fairbanks asked if anyone looked at the effect of rising gas prices on this plan. Mr. Anderson stated that they did; there are a lot of issues relative to travel behavior and future technologies. Mr. Anderson noted that the corridor recommendations are illustrative and

unfunded at this time, and developers might need to re-evaluate where they will put their private sector investments. Mr. Smith stated that as the study goes forward, the maps will state that all corridor recommendations are illustrative and unfunded to make it clear to the development community.

8. Transportation Planning Update

Kelly Taft, MAG Communications Manager, stated that in December 2007, the Regional Council amended the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to allow MAG to conduct a public attitude survey to measure voter opinions regarding transportation issues. In March 2008, MAG contracted with WestGroup Research to conduct the survey, which also included three focus groups. Ms. Taft reported that the findings of the focus groups were presented at the May Management Committee meeting and an executive summary of the final report was at each place.

Ms. Taft stated that the purpose of the survey was to measure regional and statewide public attitudes, opinions, and interests relevant to addressing transportation mobility needs, including potential solutions and timing. She reported that the process began with the three focus groups that were conducted in March 2008 in Yavapai, Pima, and Maricopa Counties to provide input into the polling instrument. Ms. Taft noted that input on the instrument was also obtained from the Transportation Policy Committee through a workshop.

Ms. Taft stated that the telephone survey consisted of 1,224 high efficacy voters, defined as participating in two out of three of the last general elections. Ms. Taft noted that quotas were set for gender, age, and political party. She said that of the telephone surveys conducted, 720 were in Maricopa County, 240 in Pima County, and 240 in the outlying areas. Ms. Taft stated that 48 percent of the respondents were male and 52 percent were female. The average age was about 54 years, and the average income was \$69,000. Ms. Taft stated that 46 percent were employed full-time, seven percent part-time, and 34 percent were retired.

Ms. Taft then provided a review of the survey results. She said that participants were asked what they felt was the most important issue facing Arizona today. The top five in order were illegal immigration, the economy/unemployment, education, gas prices, and the budget deficit. She noted that transportation was not among the top five issues.

Ms. Taft stated that the next question asked the most important issue facing Arizona in the next five to ten years. She noted that the top two responses remained the same as the previous question, but the next two issues in order of importance were issues related to growth: water/water rights and growth/sprawl.

Ms. Taft said that the next question asked what voters felt was the most important transportation issue in Arizona. The top issues in order were lack of public transit, gas prices, an inadequate amount or size of highways, and traffic congestion.

Ms. Taft stated that respondents were then asked a series of satisfaction questions. They were asked to rate their satisfaction with the transportation system in Arizona on a scale of one to five, with one the lowest and five the highest. She noted that very few voters indicated a high level

of satisfaction with the statewide transportation system, with only 20 percent of the participants rating their satisfaction at a four or five. She added that the largest percentage of respondents reported a moderate level of satisfaction, with 38 percent rating their satisfaction at a three. Ms. Taft stated that Pima County residents were the least satisfied.

Ms. Taft stated that they were asked to rate their satisfaction with the transportation system in their area. She noted that 27 percent indicated they were very satisfied, and added that Maricopa County was 28 percent, Pima County 19 percent, and the outlying areas 31 percent.

Ms. Taft said that the next question asked responders about satisfaction with transportation elements in their area. She said that satisfaction with the individual components of the transportation system was notably higher than for the system overall. This is particularly true among Maricopa County voters, with high levels of satisfaction with streets/roads, the freeways, and bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Ms. Taft stated that the bus/transit system had the lowest satisfaction overall. She noted that Pima County voters are least satisfied with the freeways and highways in their area.

Ms. Taft stated that the next question asked about traffic congestion. She stated that overall, 49 percent of the respondents indicated traffic congestion in their area is a big problem. Ms. Taft stated that those living in the rural areas were less likely to report congestion as a problem.

Ms. Taft stated that respondents were asked to indicate their traffic delay experience when they traveled around the state. She said that all agreed the most congestion was in Maricopa County, whether or not they were residents.

Ms. Taft stated that the next question asked, "What is the one most important transportation improvement that could be made in your area?" She noted that Maricopa County participants indicated a desire for improved transit, while Pima County participants indicated a preference for more roads and freeways.

Ms. Taft stated that the respondents were asked to answer yes or no to their willingness to support additional taxes by transportation solution. She stated that more than 60 percent of Maricopa County voters indicated they would support taxes for more freeway lanes and increased routes and frequency for public transit. Ms. Taft noted that Maricopa County voters were also likely to support taxes for building new freeways and building commuter rail connecting suburbs with the center of the metropolitan area, while Pima County voters were significantly more likely than others to indicate they would support additional taxes for a regional high-speed rail system connecting Phoenix and Tucson. Ms. Taft advised that the outlying areas were most likely to support taxes for improving bicycling and walking conditions.

Ms. Taft stated that respondents were then asked to rate from one to five (strongly agree) their agreement with transportation solutions. She noted that the total number of participants was broken down into two groups due to the number of solutions. Ms. Taft stated that 77 percent of the survey participants indicated they are most likely to agree with the statement that any statewide transportation plan should contain a map indicating the improvements that are included in the plan and when they will be built. She noted that the next three statements also received agreement from a majority of voters: More public transit is needed for commuters

during rush hour; more emphasis should be placed on public transit improvements than freeways over the next 30 years, and significant investments need to be made to improve, repair and maintain major city streets. Ms. Taft advised that the voters were least likely to agree that they would support a tax increase for transportation if it means the sales tax in their community would exceed 10 percent.

Ms. Taft stated that participants were asked their perspective if technical studies should be conducted prior to a statewide proposition. She advised that the two options of doing the studies first and moving forward now were each favored by 46 percent of the respondents. Ms. Taft noted that this question was asked before the TIME Coalition launched its petition drive.

Ms. Taft stated that participants were asked their perspective on the economy and taxes. Forty-seven percent felt that increased funding for transportation would help the economy. Forty-eight percent felt that now is not the time for new taxes.

Ms. Taft stated that the participants were asked to give a rating of one through five (strongly agree) on their agreement with funding solutions. Sixty-four percent felt that permanent transportation funding is needed to continue to meet transportation needs; 59 percent felt that current funding is not adequate to keep pace with needs over 30 years; Ms. Taft stated that 36 percent of the respondents did not agree that a smaller package of transportation projects was preferable; and 31 percent were likely to support a transportation tax if taxes for other programs, such as education and healthcare, were included.

Ms. Taft stated that voters were asked to distribute \$100 on transportation options. She noted that the survey was divided in half due to length, and both versions included the four areas of freeways/highways; street/road improvements; light rail, and bus service. Ms. Taft stated that for the fifth choice, half of the respondents were given the choice of high-speed transit from Phoenix to Tucson or Phoenix to Flagstaff, and the other half the choice of commuter trains from the suburbs into the center of the metropolitan area. Ms. Taft stated that the participants put the largest proportion of the dollars into freeways/highways (approximately \$27) and street/road improvements (approximately \$25). The remaining dollars were evenly divided among the public transportation options. She noted that Pima County voters who were interviewed using Version Two, which included the option for high-speed transit between Phoenix & Tucson, gave a higher proportion of dollars to that option than the suburbs-to-center-city option. That lowered the percentage Pima voters gave to streets and roads in Version Two (from \$31 to \$24).

Ms. Taft stated that in the next question, it was explained that Maricopa County generates 67 percent of the sales tax and makes up more than 60 percent of the state's population. The voters were then asked, based on this information, what is the percentage of a statewide tax you believe should be spent in Maricopa County? Ms. Taft noted that on average, voters felt that 53 percent of a statewide tax should be spent in Maricopa County, with 56 percent indicated by Maricopa County respondents. She added that only six percent of the respondents felt that 76 percent to 100 percent of the tax should be spent in Maricopa County.

Ms. Taft stated that the list from the next question was also divided in half. She reported that the participants were read a list of five or six options for funding improvements to the transportation

system in the state and were asked to indicate if they would support or oppose each funding option. Ms. Taft advised that the only two options garnering support from a majority of voters are increased developer fees and dedicating a portion of the future growth in existing tax revenues to support transportation; the least supported option was a statewide property tax.

Ms. Taft said that the next question asked how long a transportation tax should be in effect, most voters said there should be a 20-year limit on any increase in transportation funding before being reviewed for continuation of funding. She remarked that this is particularly true among those likely to vote “yes” on a sales tax in November.

Ms. Taft stated that the next question asked, “There is a proposed proposition to the ballot in November to increase the statewide sales tax by one percent. Revenue would dedicate 58 percent to building new freeways and expanding existing freeways, including I-10 and I-17, give 20 percent to local transportation improvements, give 18 percent to expanding bus and rail transit statewide, and give four percent to transportation projects and open space preservation. Would you vote yes in favor of increasing the tax, or no in opposition to increasing the tax?” Ms. Taft said 54 percent of voters statewide indicated they would vote “yes” on a one percent increase with 30 percent saying they would probably vote yes and 24 percent definitely yes. She commented that 27 percent indicated they would “definitely” vote “no”. She stated that there are no significant differences by county of residence. Ms. Taft added that while the petition drive had not yet been launched, we did get the language for this question from TIME supporters.

Ms. Taft stated that the next question posed to the participants was whether they would prefer to delay a transportation tax to a ballot in 2010, rather than in 2008, which would provide time for technical studies to be completed, provide time for citizen input, and allow the economy to improve. She said that 57 percent of the participants indicated their preference to delay the vote, and 38 percent indicated their preference to not delay the vote. Ms. Taft stated that those likely to vote “no” were more inclined than those likely to vote “yes” to indicate they would prefer to delay the tax until 2010, while only half of those who are likely to vote “yes” on the tax increase would prefer to keep it in 2008. She noted that voters in outlying areas of the state were somewhat more likely to indicate a preference for a delay.

Ms. Taft stated that the last question asked participants the likelihood they would vote for a candidate supporting the sales tax for transportation. She reported that only 37 percent of voters indicated they would be likely to vote for a candidate who supports a tax increase for transportation, with 23 percent feeling strongly they would probably not support a candidate who supported the tax. Ms. Taft noted that the largest percentage – 25 percent – indicated a neutral position. Chair McClendon thanked Ms. Taft for her report and asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Bacon asked if respondents were given multiple choices when asked about their top transportation issues. Ms. Taft replied that the most significant issues questions were open-ended and respondents were not read a list. She said that on the later questions, in testing support for various funding options, the respondents were read a list.

Mr. Anderson continued the agenda item with a transportation planning update. He provided an overview of the TIME Coalition initiative. He noted that ADOT estimates a one percent sales tax would generate \$42.6 billion, and perhaps up to \$50 billion, over 30 years. Mr Anderson commented on the concerns that have been expressed that a one percent sales tax will push the total rate in some cities to more than ten percent, and added that 30 of the 93 cities in the state, including five in Maricopa County, would have rates above ten percent if the tax passed. He stated that the components of the initiative include 55 percent (\$23.4 billion) toward strategic highway projects, 18 percent (\$7.7 billion) toward strategic rail and transit projects and programs, 20 percent (\$8.5 billion) toward local mobility projects and programs, four percent (\$1.7 billion) to transportation enhancement and walkable/bikeable communities, and three percent (\$1.3 billion) to conservation.

Mr. Anderson noted that 49 percent of the highway fund is specified for MAG regional projects, 12 percent to Pima County, and 39 percent to the rest of the state. He stated that of the public transportation fund, eight percent would go to the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) in the MAG region and five percent to the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) in Tucson. He noted that \$600 million is intended to fund light rail in the MAG region and \$400 million for the modern streetcar project in Tucson. He said that 87 percent of the fund would go toward intercity rail, commuter rail, and other transit services.

Mr. Anderson stated that of the local mobility funds, 60 percent would be committed to the MAG region, which would be distributed to the county, cities, towns and tribal communities based on population. He noted that the distribution to the remainder of the state would be made according to the Highway Users Revenue Fund formula. Mr. Anderson advised that local mobility funds could be used for any transportation project.

Mr. Anderson stated that the enhancement funds would be distributed directly to counties, cities, towns and tribal communities based on population. Mr. Anderson stated that the distribution would be patterned after the federal enhancement funds program. He advised that there are some restrictions on projects, and added that these funds could be used toward such programs as Safe Routes to School and neighborhood mitigation projects.

Mr. Anderson stated that under the conservation category, grants would be administered by ADOT for open space conservation and wildlife habitat restoration and preservation that are affected by transportation projects. He noted that local governments and 501(c)(3) organizations would be able to apply for these funds.

Mr. Anderson provided a breakdown of the more than \$20 billion in investments to be made in the MAG region. He displayed a list of the highway projects in the ADOT proposal, which total more than \$11 billion, and mostly consist of extensions and accelerations to projects in Proposition 400, in addition to approximately ten percent of the fund for some public private partnership projects. Mr. Anderson then displayed a list of public transit projects and programs, high speed intercity and commuter rail projects. He added that he was unsure the process used by ADOT to derive the project costs.

Mr. Anderson noted that approximately 50 percent of the \$42.6 billion is estimated to come to the MAG region, based on the ADOT investment plan, and added that 60 percent of the state's

population resides in Maricopa County and two-thirds of the sales tax is generated in Maricopa County.

Mr. Anderson displayed a map of the percent return estimated to be returned by county. He indicated that four counties – Maricopa, Yuma, Cochise, and Greenlee – would be donor counties, which means they would receive back less than 100 percent on their investments. Mr. Anderson noted a caveat that the map was based on ADOT's investment plan, which used current census figures for the distribution of local and enhancement funds. He noted that actual distribution of these funds will be determined by future population growth, and future sales taxes collections will be determined by the distribution of future economic activity. Mr. Anderson said that due to the fact that Greenlee County consists of mostly copper mines and not a lot of transportation projects, its return is estimated at approximately 13 percent.

Mr. Anderson stated that the TIME Coalition is in the process of collecting signatures. He said that more than 153,000 valid signatures are needed by July 3, 2008. Mr. Anderson stated that ADOT will hold public meetings around the state in June to present the program. He noted that two of the public meetings have been held – one in Marana and one in Flagstaff – and a third one was scheduled for 5:00 p.m. that day at the Phoenix Convention Center. Mr. Anderson advised that action by the State Transportation Board to approve the strategic investment plan, with the exception of the MAG projects, is anticipated in June or July 2008. He advised that highway projects for the MAG region will be submitted to MAG as a recommendation only; the project timing and priorities would not yet be determined. Mr. Anderson noted that this recognizes the cooperative process that is followed by MAG and ADOT in a Transportation Management Area.

Chair McClendon asked for clarification if the \$1.4 billion amount for SR 303 was to complete the project. Mr. Anderson explained that was correct. He noted that he thought the additional description may refer to the need for more intersections or for the addition of the Northern Avenue/303 connection.

Mr. Fairbanks asked for clarification of SR 801 that was noted in the potential public private partnership projects list. Mr. Anderson explained that SR 801 was the I-10 Reliever. This extension is from Loop 303 to SR 85.

9. Election of Officers

Mr. Isom moved to elect Charlie McClendon as Chair and Mark Pentz as Vice Chair of the Management Committee, beginning July 1, 2008, and ending June 30, 2009. Mr. Fairbanks seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

10. Legislative Update

Nathan Pryor, MAG Senior Policy Planner, provided an update on legislative issues of interest. He noted that an updated bill summary chart was at each place, revised to take out those bills that appear to be inactive and include only those bills that are technically active.

Mr. Pryor stated that the Legislature has been meeting about three days per week on the State's budget. He said that leadership has been in closed door meetings with reported little discussion

with the rank and file membership. Mr. Pryor commented that it appears the 2009 budget process is similar to the 2008 budget in that leadership will offer a proposal with limited opportunity for amendments.

Mr. Pryor stated that discussion about possible funding of DPS with HURF funding is being monitored. He noted that no amount has been determined.

Mr. Pryor stated that a SAFETEA-LU correction bill was signed by the President on June 6, 2008. Mr. Pryor reported that the correction allows for a higher share of federal funds based on public lands percentage. He noted that in the last version of SAFETEA-LU, Arizona was left out, but with the correction, Arizona now moves to third place. Mr. Pryor explained that the state/local share was 28 percent and federal 72 percent before the correction; state/local is now 5.7 percent and federal is 94.3 percent. He added that this especially affects rural areas, and noted that this is below the line funding and is for projects not on the Interstate system.

11. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for Management Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Management Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Chair McClendon introduced the Acting City Manager for Scottsdale, John Little.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:05p.m.

Secretary

Chairman